arXiv:0806.0699v4 [physics.gen-ph] 6 Aug 2008

Principles of statistical mechanics: the energy duality

V.E. Shapiro*
TRIUMF, Vancouver, BC, Canada

We argue that statistical mechanics of systems with relaxation implies breaking the energy function of systems into two having different transformation rules. With this duality the energy approach incorporates the generalized vortex forces. We show general theorems and their implications and apply the approach to the particle confinement in fields of rotational symmetry. Misconceptions of extensive use of the quasienergy and generalized thermodynamic potential theories are exposed.

PACS numbers: 02.70.Rr 05.70.Ln 05.90.+m

Introduction

While the main word in physics is interaction of systems given by an energy function, this notion is well defined for the ideal of closed systems via their motion integrals. For the real world, of open systems in long lasting non-equilibrium states against the background of fluctuating environment, the meaning of energy function is vague and causes misleading associations and mistakes in energy reasoning and modeling. A new formulation of energy approach to open systems is suggested in this Letter.

We found this matter important even in conditions of low-rate irreversible forcing, for its nonlinear cumulative effect on the trend of system's steady state, stability and fluctuations can be drastic and different from the trend given by the theory of generalized thermodynamic potential [1-3] commonly accepted in the study of heating/cooling, transport and phase transitions. This paradigm fits the ideal of closed systems, showing no energy vagueness. The generalized potential of a system relaxing in steady conditions to a probability density $\rho_{\rm st}$ connects to $\rho_{\rm st}$ by

$$\rho_{\rm st} = Ne^{-\Phi}, \quad N^{-1} = \int e^{-\Phi} d\Gamma \tag{1}$$

where the integral is over the volume Γ of system phase space and the reversible motion is on surfaces $\Phi = const$. The properties of the system mainly depend then on the local properties of the minima of Φ. The analogous approach to systems under high frequency fields is in terms of the picture where the hf field looks fixed or its effect is time-averaged. In all this, Eq. (1) merely redefines the distribution $\rho_{\rm st}$ in terms of function Φ, and taking this function as the energy integral of reversible motion provides the physical basis of the theory, but implies rigid constraints.

Let us start the analysis of these constraints and the energy approach beyond them with formulating general theorems.

*Electronic address: vshapiro@triumf.ca

Three theorems: of entrainment, energy indeterminism and energy duality

I. The system whose reversible-motion integral and steady distribution of states $\rho_{\rm st}$ are in a one-to-one relation must carry along, on the average over $\rho_{\rm st}$, the environment contributing to its fluctuations and dissipation. The relation of $\rho_{\rm st}$ to Φ can be taken as the one in question without loss of generality. Connecting Φ to the energy function of system implies scaling this function in terms of environmental-noise level of energy. The energy scale set so must vary proportionally with the energy in arbitrarily moving frames while Φ defined by (1) must not vary. This constraint can hold only for the systems carried along with the environment on the average and must break beyond this entrainment ideal, hence the proof.

II. The energy integral of reversible motion of the systems relaxing to a steady distribution $\rho_{\rm st}$ beyond the entrainment ideal ceases to exist. Indeed, as follows from the proof of theorem I, neither Φ (1) nor any univalent function of it can be the energy integral, and it cannot be a function of transient process to $\rho_{\rm st}$ as well, for the energy integral of reversible motion must be independent of transient states in Γ.

The energy integral break-up can be proved also as follows. The non-entrained steady state implies a steady mean motion in Γ. The relaxation to it implies that the irreversible forces exerted on the motion do not vanish as $t \to \infty$ and are of vortex type in Γ as their forcing toward the steady motion and against it differ in sign. Such forces form both the $\rho_{\rm st}$ and the approach to it. Thus the energy integral ceases to exist there, being blurred by the vortex forces.

III. The whole blurring must come down to that the notion of system energy function (Hamiltonian) adopted as one-valued for a certain standing must then bifurcate. Its two Hamiltonians represent the constraints relating the partial derivatives of Hamiltonian with respect to the phase space variables of the system to its instant state. One is bound with Φ and represents the constraints on the motion relative to the environment as the source of diffusion/dissipation; the time reversal decomposition is with respect to the parity associated with the partial derivatives of just this Hamiltonian, so the irreversible

drift is determined by them and hence this Hamiltonian. The other governs the system motion unrelated to the said source, but is also involved in forming the $\rho_{\rm st}$ and the transition to it. This is the only way to comply with the arguments in I and II, and this is what we called the energy duality.

The difference between the two energy functions is due to the work of vortex forces. In its turn the difference function acts as their energy measure. Thereby the vortex forces are incorporated into the energy concept.

The theorems of entrainment, indeterminism and duality shown above admit extension to the systems in unsteady conditions so long as the probability description is adequate and the probability distribution of system states exists and relaxes from the domain of initial conditions to a common, limit t-dependent distribution. The proof follows from the fact that a limit distribution is reducible to a steady one with univalent transformations of Γ.

Historically (e.g. reviews [3,4]) the necessary and sufficient conditions of generalized potential theory were formulated as detailed balance within the framework of autonomous Fokker-Planck equations for the variables and parameters dividable into odd and even with respect to time reversal. The detailed balance complies with the entrainment ideal. Our theorems presented above set the energy approach to wider conditions.

Let us now give the introduced notions substance and consider implications.

Problem statement via kinetic equations

We consider the probability density $\rho(z,t)$ of system states z as prime and determine the concept of system energy function from its time evolution. The interactions with fluctuating environment will be considered within the equations of general form

$$\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = [H,\rho] - \frac{\partial S_i}{\partial z_i} \tag{2}$$

from a given initial distribution $\rho(z,0)$ under natural boundary conditions. Without the part $\partial S_i/\partial z_i$, Eq. (2) is the Liouville's equation of a dynamic system of Hamiltonian H, a function of a number of canonical coordinates $x=(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ and moments $p=(p_1,\dots,p_n)$ taken as z, $z=(x,p)$. $[\,,\,]$ denotes the Poisson brackets,

$$[H,\rho] = \frac{\partial H}{\partial x_i}\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial p_i} - \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x_i}.$$

Summation over repeated dummy indexes is implied. $S=\{S_i\}$ is a $2n$-vector functional of ρ in z, vanishing at the boundaries to preserve the normalization of ρ, includes the irreversible probability currents. These currents depend on the system's motion, and this dependence in its turn affects the energy concept.

In diffusional approximation

$$S_i = \left(f_i - d_{ik}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\right)\rho, \quad i,k=1,\dots 2n \tag{3}$$

where $f=\{f_i\}$ are dissipative forces and $d=\{d_{ik}\}$ is a symmetric positive semi-definite matrix of diffusion. Eq. (2) is then a general Fokker-Planck equation written in terms of canonical variables of the reversible dynamics given by H.

S may be nonlinear in ρ and integro-differential in z, unless specified otherwise, and we use the term kinetic also for such equations (2). The parameters entering H and S may depend not only on z but also on t to allow for interactions with varying regular fields and varying chaotic environments.

Entrainment ideal. Its simplest modeling corresponds to S of form (3) with f and d having non-vanishing components pertaining only to the space of p, with d a constant positive-definite matrix $n\times n$ and f a n-component force of viscous friction

$$f_i = -\beta d_{ik} v_k \tag{4}$$

where β^{-1} is a scale of noise energy and $v=(v_1,\dots,v_n)$ the velocity given by Hamiltonian dynamics,

$$v_i = \partial H(x,p,t)/\partial p_i. \tag{5}$$

For a t-independent H bounded below, the stationary solution of (2) is then the Boltzmann distribution

$$\rho_{\rm B}(z) = Ne^{-\beta H(z)}, \quad N^{-1} = \int e^{-\beta H(z)} d^{2n}z. \tag{6}$$

The meaning of β expounds the known equipartition theorem ensuing from (6): for every component of z (coordinate or momentum) whose contribution to H reduces to a square term, say, $\kappa_1(z_j-\kappa_2)^2$ with $k_1\neq 0$ and $\kappa_{1,2}$ independent of z_j, its mean over the Boltzmann distribution comes to

$$\langle\kappa_1(z_j-\kappa_2)^2\rangle_{\rm B} = \beta^{-1} \tag{7}$$

irrespective of parameters $\kappa_{1,2}$. This theorem holds not only for constant $\kappa_{1,2}$ but also for $\kappa_{1,2}$ depending on other components of z and on t, which is not insignificant for "quasistationary" Boltzmann distributions. By virtue of (5) and assuming natural boundary conditions

$$\int v e^{-\beta H(x,p,t)} {\rm d}^n p = 0. \tag{8}$$

So the average $\langle v(x,p,t)\rangle_{\rm B}=0$ over p for any x, which is the entrainment ideal for the case.

The same features hold beyond the linear friction and constant diffusion rates, being also in effect for the f and d of elements pertaining to both x and p spaces and depending on both z and t, provided that

$$f_i = -\beta d_{ik}\frac{\partial H}{\partial z_k}, \quad i,k=1,\dots 2n \tag{9}$$

and that the matrix d ensures approach of the solutions of (2) to a unique steady state. One comes then to (6) and thus to the proof. Note that the $2n$ vector $\bar{v} = \partial H/\partial z$ has norm $|\bar{v}| = |[z, H]|$ but $\bar{v} \perp [z, H]$.

The entrained steady state in terms of Eq. (2) implies

$$(\partial S_i/\partial z_i)_{\rho=\rho_{\rm st}} = 0. \tag{10}$$

The detailed balance defined as vanishing irreversible probability currents between any two states of the system complies with condition (10). Upon (10), the equipartition theorem loses its force beyond approximation (3), e.g., when jump random influences is a factor, for the steady solution to (2) becomes non-Boltzmann, but $[H, \rho_{\rm st}(z)]$ always equals zero, hence, the yardstick (1).

The theorem IV: The canonical invariance of the irreversible operator of kinetic equations

Let us show that the irreversible operator of kinetic equations is an invariant of canonical transformations. This theorem is the essence of the claimed energy dualism and embodies its basic rule.

Consider a canonical transformation $z \to Z$ of Eq. (2). The Poisson bracket is then to be invariant, as well as the probability density $\rho(z, t)$. The latter turns into $\Pi(Z, t)$ according to $\rho(z, t)\mathrm{d}^{2n}z = \Pi(Z, t)d^{2n}Z$ which results in $\rho(z, t) = \Pi((Z(z, t), t)$ since the Jacobian of any canonical transformation

$$|\det\{\partial Z_k(z, t)/\partial z_i\}_{i,k=1}^{2n}| = 1. \tag{11}$$

Under the transformation, the $\partial\rho/\partial t$ of (2) gives rise to $\partial\Pi(Z, t)/\partial t$ plus the addition $Z_i'\partial\Pi(Z, t)/\partial Z_i$ where

$$Z' = \partial Z(z, t)/\partial t$$

is the local velocity of map $z \to Z$. By virtue of (11) this velocity as a function of Z is divergence-free, $\partial Z_i'(z(Z, t), t)/\partial Z_i = 0$, as can be shown by differentiating both parts of (11) and using Cramer's rule. Therefore the addition contributes entirely to the reversible drift, reducing to the Poisson bracket $[G, \Pi]$ where

$$\partial G(Z, t)/\partial X = -P', \quad \partial G(Z, t)/\partial P = X', \tag{12}$$

(X, P) denote the conjugated n-component coordinates and moments of Z, and $(X', P') = Z'$. That is,

$$\partial\rho(z, t)/\partial t - [H, \rho] = \partial\Pi(Z, t)/\partial t - [\mathrm{H}, \Pi]$$

with both sides understood as functions of either z, t or Z, t and where H is the transformed Hamiltonian,

$$\mathrm{H} = H + G. \tag{13}$$

So, nothing is added to the $\partial S_i/\partial z_i$ part of (2) under the transformation and this part preserves invariance. This and that ρ is canonically invariant completes the proof of the theorem if S is purely irreversible, i.e. for the Hamiltonian H implied dressed. The proof holds also for the part $\partial S_i/\partial z_i$ decomposable into a pure irreversible term plus Poisson bracket terms. The latter are canonically invariant, so is therefore the irreversible term and hence its operator.

It follows from the theorem that the time-symmetry decomposition once adopted in (2) must hold further for an arbitrary time dependence of the parameters of H and S. The irreversible operator, being invariant under arbitrary canonical transformations and initially adopted related to the system's motion given by the invariant Poisson bracket $[z, H]$, must preserve its dependence on H, while the reversible operator must change as H transforms into H. This means the energy duality. The difference G between the two Hamiltonians depends on the Z' given by (12) and can much exceed H in effect. Respectively the effects of energy duality can be strong.

In general the decomposition of S is in question. Say, for S representing a retarded functional of ρ, i.e., acting not only in argument z but also in t, the notion of irreversible operator is vague and the theorem loses its force. As for the energy duality principle, it is to be viewed applicable in compliance with theorem III to an initially adopted H versus the operator of whole S.

Averaging versus canonical transformations

The emergence of irreversible behaviors is often referred to the averaging of a conservative many-body system given by a microscopic Hamiltonian and random initial conditions. This cue misleads in the question of both statistical and dynamical averaging. Averaging the Liouville's equation of the system over the statistics of initial conditions specifies the initial distribution function while its probabilistic evolution is governed by the same equation. Also, so long as its solution is unique, integrating this equation over the irrelevant variables reduces to a canonical transformation splitting the microscopic Hamiltonian into an averaged part independent of the remaining part, which leaves no place for the irreversible probability currents.

While splitting of a Hamiltonian system into an averaged subsystem independent of the rest corresponds, ideally, to some canonical transformation, thinking the same way of systems where irreversible flows matter is incorrect. No questions arise for the averaging over the interactions and influences treated as small, disregarding their nonlinear effect; but the averaging causing appreciable irreversible flows is different, and it never reduces to canonical transformations, for by virtue of theorem IV such flows would not emerge or change. This is so whether the system is conservative or not. As for the systems under time dependent influences treated as a random process, its exact statistical averaging causes irreversible flows as set already on the probability evolution of the random process. Some way or other, the

irreversible flows emerge or change only due to truncations of interactions. Just as the flows, the energy duality is a relative category. Regularly recurring processes lend weight to them, and so is the scientific cognition.

Practically, a theory established for some conditions is extended further to interactions with more fields to model transitions to underspecified states and instabilities. The trend of irreversible flows then may change, act as inverse truncation if left intact, and, being uncertain, it is usually assumed in accordance with the paradigm of entrainment ideal. For example, the impact of fields associated with Feshbach resonance [5] on many body systems is commonly treated presently as the initial entrainment ideal $\rho_{\rm st} = \rho_{\rm st}(H)$ turning into the final ideal $\rho_{\rm st} = \rho_{\rm st}({\rm H})$ where Hamiltonian H includes the field. Departure from this taken-for-granted trend in transitions means admitting a steady non-entrained state, a relaxation sort of persistent currents setting in.

An important field where at stake is whether to stick to the generalized thermodynamic potential or follow the principles of energy duality is the impact of high frequency fields on the system's probability evolution. So we can view also the foregoing persistent currents in the moving picture where they look frozen and where the arising hf field is to be treated self-consistently. Let us dwell here on typical models of H containing hf terms treated as given and S of form (3) with the constraints on d and f as stipulated in the paragraph with Eq. (9) for such $H = H(z,t)$. The hf part of H is assumed of finite amplitude and frequencies high enough to invalidate the approximation of distribution $\rho(z,t)$ by quasistationary Boltzmann distribution (6). A characteristic measure often in use then, and we question its extensive use, is the Boltzmann $\rho(z,t) = \Pi_{\rm B}[Z(z,t)]$,

$$\Pi_{\rm B}(Z) = e^{-\beta {\rm H}(Z)} \left[\int e^{-\beta {\rm H}(Z)} d^{2n} Z \right]^{-1}, \qquad (14)$$

in terms of canonical Z where ${\rm H}(Z)$ is the quasienergy, the t-independent function H given by (13), or its surrogate given by the effective potential i.e. the Hamiltonian of smoothed dynamics $Z(t)$ obtained on hf averaging the equations $dz/dt = [z, H(z,t)]$ for $z = z(t)$.

The conversion to terms of quasienergy or effective Hamiltonian is a highway in physics, it clears up the energy considerations of purely dynamic systems since the t-dependence of H makes their energy a vague notion. However, the measure (14), being the exact steady distribution for zero hf field, violates the canonical invariance theorem and leaves no place for the energy duality for any finite hf fields, which suggests the inadequacy of (14) in many conditions.

Obviously the approximation (14) is not valid on the stages before thermalization unless the state is prepared so initially. But even prepared so, the dynamic system $Z(t)$ given by the Hamiltonian ${\rm H}(Z)$ is not entrained. As it vibrates with respect to the environment persistently and rapidly, in time with the hf field, there arise mean vortex forces having a cumulative bearing on the system's behaviors which is generally substantial, as elucidated below.

The vortex impact of time dependent fields

The division of generalized forces and impacts into types implies reasoning and transforms in terms of specific variables. Canonical ones give division with respect to irreversibility, and the terms where the system Hamiltonian is independent of time give a subdivision – of reversible forces into potential versus gyroscopic and, as shown below, of their irreversible counterpart into vortex versus non-vortex forces.

Transforming Eq. (2) with constraints (3), (9) where $H = H(z,t)$ includes given (t dependent) fields to canonical variables Z where H (13) is t-independent, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Pi = [{\rm H}, \Pi] + \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_i}\left(\beta D_{ik} \frac{\partial({\rm H} - G)}{\partial Z_k} + D_{ik} \frac{\partial}{\partial Z_k} \right) \Pi \qquad (15)$$

where the elements

$$D_{ij} = d_{kn} \frac{\partial Z_k(z,t)}{\partial z_i} \frac{\partial Z_n(z,t)}{\partial z_j} \qquad (16)$$

comprise the matrix D of diffusion. D is positive semidefinite like matrix d by virtue of (11). Π, G and D are understood in (15) as functions of Z and t, with z expressed via Z and t. Obviously both $z \to Z$ and $Z \to z$ are one-to-one maps by virtue of (11).

Since H of (15) is independent of t, the components

$$F_i^{\rm ei} = -\beta D_{ik} \frac{\partial {\rm H}}{\partial Z_k} \qquad (17)$$

(where $i, k = 1, \dots 2n$) comprise the irreversible drift force $F^{\rm ei}$ corresponding to the entrainment ideal, and the irreversible drift force $F^{\rm ne}$ of components

$$F_i^{\rm ne} = \beta D_{ik} \frac{\partial G}{\partial Z_k} \qquad (18)$$

is due to the non-entrainment caused by the given field.

Let us juxtapose the work done by these two forces and diffusion on the system. Multiplying both sides of (15) by H and integrating over space Z results in

$$\frac{d\langle {\rm H} \rangle}{dt} = -\beta \langle D_{ik} \bar{V}_i \bar{V}_k \rangle + \beta \langle D_{ik} \bar{V}_i \bar{Z}'_k \rangle + \langle \frac{\partial D_{ik} \bar{V}_i}{\partial Z_k} \rangle \qquad (19)$$

where $\bar{V} = \partial {\rm H}/\partial Z$ is the vector orthogonal to $[Z, {\rm H}]$ and its norm $|\bar{V}| = |[Z, {\rm H}]|$, and $\partial G/\partial Z$ of (12) is rewritten as $\bar{Z}'$ since it is orthogonal to Z' and $|\bar{Z}'| = |Z'|$.

The quadratic form $D_{ik} \bar{V}_i \bar{V}_k \geq 0$, hence the power of force $F^{\rm ei}$ (17) is always dissipative, tends to decrease $\langle {\rm H} \rangle$. The mean power of diffusion forces, the third sum in the rhs of (19), is always positive, anti-dissipative near steady states in the limit of weak given fields, for only it then remains to balance dissipation due to $F^{\rm ei}$.

In contrast, the power of force $F^{\rm ne}$ can be positive as well as negative. It is positive when the vectors $\bar V$ and $\bar Z'$ are parallel and negative when antiparallel. So the sign of work of $F^{\rm ne}$ over a closed path in phase space Z depends on direction of path-tracing, which is intrinsic of a mean vortex force. As evident from (19), the mean power of vortex force prevails over that of dissipative $F^{\rm ei}$ as the speed $\bar V$ of system decreases compared to the speed $\bar Z'$ of non-entrainment.

Not only the steady distribution can then strongly differ from Boltzmann (14), but also the stability threshold of the system can appreciably retreat toward as inside as outside the domain given by (14), i.e., where the $\mathrm{H}(Z)$ is bounded below. Also the rates of relaxation can be much higher or lower than given by eigenvalues of βD.

Particularly this concerns the nonlinear impact of high frequency fields, even relatively weak, as is the case of long lasting rotation/vibration systems near resonances, including parametric and combinational. This was brought up in various fields by the present author, e.g.,[6-12]. Note that we referred to as vortex there only the vortex force field in the coordinate space of system, rather than in all phase space, as in the present work.

Multi-bath extension

The energy duality formulated above is with respect to the guide of entrainment limit. It does not cover the realm of environments not carried along between themselves on the average. However, the energy duality principle then displays through treating the realm as a superposition of environments ("baths") each compliant with detailed balance and moving with respect to each other. Applied to diffusional approximation, this is a number of baths each compliant with constraints (9) on d and f in the picture of canonical variables where the system is carried along it. On account of the canonical invariance theorem we then come out with the irreversible drift force f related to the diffusion matrix d in Eq. (3) so

$$f = -\sum \beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}_{ik} \frac{\partial (H + G^{\rm r})}{\partial z_k}, \quad d = \sum d^{\rm r}. \tag{20}$$

Here $\sum$ means summing over the superscript r labeling the quantities related to each of the baths, $\beta^{\rm r}$ is the noise-energy scale of bath r, $d^{\rm r}$ its contribution to the diffusion rates of the system, and $H + G^{\rm r}$ the Hamiltonian transformed to the picture of canonical variables $z^{\rm r}$ at rest with bath r. With $G^{\rm r}$ given in this picture as function of $z^{\rm r}$ and t, we have

$$\frac{\partial G^{\rm r}(z^{\rm r}(z,t),t)}{\partial z_k} = \frac{\partial z^{\rm r}_i(z,t)}{\partial z_k} \frac{\partial \bar z^{\rm r}_i(z,t)}{\partial t} \tag{21}$$

where $\bar z^{\rm r} = (-p^{\rm r}, x^{\rm r})$, $x^{\rm r}$ are the coordinates and $p^{\rm r}$ the moments of $z^{\rm r} = (x^{\rm r}, p^{\rm r})$.

It follows from (20) that the components

$$f^{\rm ei}_i = -\sum \beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}_{ik} \frac{\partial H(z,t)}{\partial z_k} \tag{22}$$

comprise the irreversible drift force $f^{\rm ei}$ exerted on the system in neglect of its motion relative to the baths, while the force $f^{\rm ne}$ of components

$$f^{\rm ne}_i = -\sum \beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}_{ik} \frac{\partial G^{\rm r}}{\partial z_k} \tag{23}$$

with $\partial G^{\rm r}/\partial z_k$ given by (21) is due to the relative motion of the system. The $f^{\rm ne}$ is vortex in space z and $f^{\rm ei}$ is non-vortex, similar to the hf forces (18) and (17) in space Z. We now arrive in space Z with the energy balance equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\langle \mathrm{H}\rangle}{dt} = & -\sum \beta^{\rm r} \langle D^{\rm r}_{ik} \bar V_i \bar V_k \rangle \\ & + \sum \beta^{\rm r} \langle D^{\rm r}_{ik} \bar V_i (\bar Z'_k - \bar Z'^{\rm r}_k) \rangle + \langle \frac{\partial D_{ik} \bar V_i}{\partial Z_k} \rangle \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $D^{\rm r}_{ik}$ is of form (16) with d_{kn} replaced by $d^{\rm r}_{kn}$ and $\bar Z'^{\rm r}$ stands for $\partial G^{\rm r}/\partial Z = J \partial G^{\rm r}/\partial z$ with J the inverse of matrix $\partial z(Z,t)/\partial Z$.

As with (19), the first sum on the right of (24) is always dissipative, tends to decrease the mean energy $\langle \mathrm{H}\rangle$ of the system and the second sum represents the power of the mean vortex force whose work over a closed path in phase space Z depends on direction of path-tracing.

Remarkably, the relation (20) between the irreversible drift force and diffusion for $\partial G^{\rm r}/\partial z = 0$ for all baths looks like the constraint (9) with $\beta = \sum \beta^{\rm r} d^{-1} d^{\rm r}$. But, this β is a matrix function of z rather than a constant scalar. It is easy to show that the relation (9) with such β represents a general constraint for the systems in the entrainment limit of diffusional approximation.

It follows that the equipartition theorem in such conditions of entrainment generally does not take place and that the steady distribution $\rho_{\rm st}$ can be reduced to a superposition of a number ($\le 2n$) of Boltzmann distributions. The latter form of solution breaks beyond the entrainment limit as well, which can be used in determining the limit.

To illustrate features of the energy duality and associated vortex physics arising in non-entrainment conditions, a simple example relevant to applications is considered below.

The vortex confinement of particles in fields of rotational symmetry

Here we apply our approach to long time confinement of particles with fields that are constant in some rotating frame. For simplicity the particle trap formed in axial direction by the field is assumed harmonic and independent of transversal particle motion. The transversal force field is allowed of arbitrary azimuthal asymmetry. So are Penning and many other traps for charged particles and neutral atoms, including a general quadrupole type of traps suggested by the author in 90-ties, see references in [12] devoted to elemental vortex statistical mechanics

of relevance. While the theory of generalized thermodynamic potential gained ground in such traps [13], it seems to be severely restricted in view of non-entrained background gas, noisy field sources and retarded reaction of trap field system (due to its finite conductance) to the particle motion.

Let us rely on [12], bringing in a wider insight and dwelling on the probability of particle motion governed by Eqs. (2), (3) with constraints of form (4) for a number of baths each rotating about the symmetry axis of trap at some frequency $\Omega^{\rm r}$ and of constant, isotropic diffusion rates $d^{\rm r}$. In the rotating-frame coordinates where the trap field is independent of t, the kinetic equation (15) for the probability distribution of particle states reduces to

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\Pi(X,P,t) = [\mathrm{H},\Pi] + \frac{\partial}{\partial P_i}\left(\beta D V_i - F_i^{\rm vort} + D\frac{\partial}{\partial P_i}\right)\Pi \tag{25}$$

where

$$D = \sum d^{\rm r} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \frac{1}{D}\sum \beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}.$$

$V = \partial \mathrm{H}/\partial P$, $-\beta D V$ is the friction force $F^{\rm ei}$ (17), $F^{\rm ne}$ (18) takes the form of net vortex force $F^{\rm vort}$ in space X. For a particle of Euclidean coordinates $X = (X_1, X_2, X_3)$

$$F^{\rm vort} = (\kappa X_2, -\kappa X_1, 0), \quad \kappa = \sum(\Omega - \Omega^{\rm r})\beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}, \tag{26}$$

Ω is the rotation frequency and X_3 along the rotation axis of trap. In the trap field modeled as given, the Hamiltonian of particle motion is of form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{H} &= \frac{1}{2}[P^2 + k_3 X_3^2 + (k_0 - 2q)X_1^2 + (k_0 + 2q)X_2^2] \\ &+ (g - \Omega)M_\Theta + \mathrm{H}^{\rm nl}\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $P = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$ are canonical moments conjugated to X. X, P are related to the canonical x, p of rest frame so $X = T(t)x, \quad P = T(t)p$,

$$T(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\Omega t & \sin\Omega t & 0 \\ -\sin\Omega t & \cos\Omega t & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$G = \mathrm{H} - H = -\Omega M_\Theta$ where H is the rest-frame Hamiltonian and M_Θ the canonical angular momentum

$$M_\Theta = x_1 p_2 - x_2 p_1 = X_1 P_2 - X_2 P_1, \tag{28}$$

$k_0 = g^2 - k_3/2$, $k_3 > 0$, $\sqrt{k_3}$ is the eigenfrequency of axial oscillator mode, q the gradient of rotating transversal quadrupole potential and $\mathrm{H}^{\rm nl}$ the potential of transversal multipoles higher than quadrupole. $\mathrm{H}^{\rm nl} = 0$ for the geometries of Penning and rotating quadrupole traps.

The confinement in line with the theory of generalized thermodynamic potential corresponds to the ideal of $\kappa = 0$ and would mean that the particle should relax to the entrained state of rotating-frame Boltzmann distribution (14) in the parameter domain where $\mathrm{H}(Z)$ (27) is bounded below, and an instability should arise as the boundedness breaks down; for $\mathrm{H}^{\rm nl} = 0$, it breaks down where

$$k_0 < (\Omega - g)^2. \tag{29}$$

The critical point $k_0 = (\Omega - g)^2$ is the apex of parametric resonance of transversal motion caused by the rotating quadrupole. However, the trends of long time confinement in considered traps strongly diverge from these predictions. For example, the traps of $g = 0$ would be impossible in principle, for any q, if condition (29) would indeed imply instability, but it may not at all in view of the non-entrainment given by $\kappa \neq 0$.

An important point to account for $\kappa \neq 0$ is that the work of vortex force over a closed path enclosing in a transversal plane (across axis X_3) an area s is equal to $\oint F^{\rm vort} dX = \pm 2\kappa s$, velocity independent, and the sign depends on the direction of motion, while the work $\oint \beta D V dX$ decreases with V and is of one sign. For a circular transversal motion of a frequency ω

$$\frac{\oint F^{\rm vort} dX_\perp}{\oint -\beta D V dX_\perp} = \frac{\Omega^*}{\omega}, \quad \Omega^* = \Omega - \frac{\sum \Omega^{\rm r}\beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}}{\sum \beta^{\rm r} d^{\rm r}} \tag{30}$$

where $X_\perp$ denotes a vector (X_1, X_2). A sizable proportion of Ω^* is due to the environments roughly at rest with the trap electrodes, of $\Omega^{\rm r} \ll \Omega$, so Ω^* and Ω are within one order. The soft mode of transversal dynamics given by H is slow, of frequency scale $\nu \ll \Omega$. So $\omega \ll \Omega^*$ for such modes. The particle stability, relaxation and steady state is critical to the soft mode, hence the dominance of vortex force impact on all that.

Importantly the dominance holds on passing the critical point into a certain parameter domain of $\mathrm{H}(Z)$ unbounded from below, where the soft mode still represents a transversal orbiting, rather than runaway motion. Such a domain is characteristic of dynamic systems with gyroscopic terms, as is the case of particle traps with rotating fields. For $\mathrm{H}^{\rm nl} = 0$, the Hamiltonian of transversal dynamics presented in normal mode presentation in the domain takes the form [12]

$$\mathrm{H}_\perp = \frac{1}{2}\nu_+(P_+^2 + X_+^2) \pm \frac{1}{2}\nu_-(P_-^2 + X_-^2) \tag{31}$$

where '$\pm$' is '+' for $k_0 > (\Omega - g)^2$ and '$-$' for $k_0 < (\Omega - g)^2$, X_+, P_+ are canonical variables of normal '+' mode and X_-, P_- of '$-$' mode, $\nu_\pm$ are positive roots of

$$\nu_\pm^2 = k_0 + (\Omega - g)^2 \pm 2\sqrt{(\Omega - g)^2 k_0 + q^2}, \tag{32}$$

and the domain of no runaway is where

$$\nu_-^2 > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad k_3 > 0. \tag{33}$$

For the apex falling in domain (33), the '$-$' mode is soft near the apex and its energy is negative below it.

Along with the dominance, another important feature of vortex force displays vigorously and not alike the friction force $-\beta D V$. The latter pumps energy out of any

motion, so its pumping out of positive-energy modes causes their damping, and pumping out of negative-energy modes causes oscillation build-up, a negative friction. So, on accounting only for the fiction force, the condition (29) would imply instability of increment $\sim \beta D$.

In contrast, the stabilizing/destabilizing impact of the vortex force does not change sign on passing the critical point but changes it on passing the point of gyroscopy compensation $g = \Omega$ by field rotation, unless both points coincide. Indeed, the energy pumped out/in the soft mode by the vortex force depends on the ellipticity of transversal-mode orbiting and whether in the rotating frame the orbiting is in the direction of field rotation or opposite to it. For $g \neq \Omega$, the sense of orbiting changes twice, on passing both points, but on passing the critical point there changes the sign of energy transfer by the vortex force, hence, its stabilizing/destabilizing impact does not change sign on transition into the domain of $\mathrm{H}(Z)$ not bound below for the same reason why there changes the sign of friction force impact.

For the models considered in this section, the vortex impact vanishes for the transversal modes of linear polarization, which is when $g = \Omega$, and is maximal for circular orbiting. For $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{nl}} = 0$, calculating the time averages of energy flows due to the vortex and friction forces in the orbiting motion corresponding to the '+' and '−' modes with exact account of their polarization forms, we obtain for their ratio, respectively

$$\left(\frac{\oint F^{\mathrm{vort}} dX_\perp}{\oint -\beta D V dX_\perp}\right)_\pm = \frac{\Omega^*}{\Omega}\frac{(g-\Omega)\Omega}{\nu_\pm^2 - k_0}. \qquad (34)$$

The ratio $\Omega^*/\Omega > 0$, so the sign of ratio next to Ω^*/Ω in (34) determines the sign of stabilization/destabilization impact of the vortex force. There the dominator $\nu_\pm^2 - k_0$ changes sign only on passing the apex for the '−' mode, as evident from (32). Thus the expressions (34) and (33) show all variety of confinement trends in question.

For $g = 0$, for example, $k_0 < 0$ and the domain (33) is completely on the side of apex where (29) holds and the soft mode is of negative energy. However, the vortex force exerts there stabilizing action on the soft mode, and for $\Omega^* = \Omega$ it prevails over destabilizing effect of force $-\beta DV$ in *all* domain (33). As for the '+' mode, the vortex impact on it is destabilizing but weaker than frictional which is stabilizing. So, a stable 3D confinement takes place in all domain (33)!

At the point of gyro-compensation $g = \Omega$, the vortex factor (34) vanishes and the trends of confinement in the trap fields of $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{nl}} = 0$ comply with the theory of generalized thermodynamic potential. However, this specific point is aside from conditions most favoring particle cooling and confinement in traps, as well as heating and selection of particles, and there the vortex force rules the trends. Depending on the ratio g/Ω and its sign, the vortex impact appears to be either stabilizing or destabilizing, resulting in amazing trends of stability, relaxation rates and steady states.

Highly important in all that is the scale Ω^*/Ω, whether it is small enough to stick to the entrainment-ideal scenario or large, comparable with 1, to have an essentially vortex picture of confinement. Characteristically the scale Ω^*/Ω and hence the factor of prevalence of the vortex impact over frictional is the same for any positive values of baths' parameters β and D, including the limit of $\beta D \to 0+$.

For $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{nl}} = 0$, the kinetic equation (25) admits exact analytical solution $\Pi(Z, t)$. It represents, for the system evolution from a given initial state in a point of phase space Z, a multivariate Gaussian distribution of system states for any $t > 0$. So all probability characteristics of transient and steady states can be traced exactly for the entire range from $\Omega^*/\Omega = 0$ to 1.

For $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{nl}} \neq 0$ the transversal Hamiltonian as nonlinear is generally inseparable into normal modes, but in any close parameter vicinity of inseparable Hamiltonian there exist separable ones. So for fairly long times the motion in the domain of no runaways can be treated as separable and of soft mode on approaching apexes of parametric or combination resonances. Therefore the vortex trends resembling those shown above are to be expected.

Additional remarks. For more complex objects than a 3D-particle in a field of rotational symmetry, representing nonlinearly coupled systems having many degrees of freedom of high and low frequencies, the vortex impact appears to be no less significant, as is, e.g., in conditions of hf subsystems excited near main or parametric or combinational resonances. Its general features in the lowest order of nonlinearities were elucidated in [6-12] where various methods of cooling and control of interacting particles, waves, domain walls etc were suggested on this basis.

Imposing on a system in conditions of entrainment a regularly varying field modeled via Hamiltonian interactions always translates into a vortex impact exerted on the system in the picture where the field looks frozen. This refers to any control of irreversible effects this way. So works the principle of energy duality. Now, with this principle, there arises a consistent and adequate energy approach to the above-cited and many other phenomena in open systems.

Conclusion

We have shown that the notion of energy function developed in analytical mechanics and thermodynamics acquires rigor and significance not only in the limit of detailed balance but also in the statistical approach to the vast world where it rules relaxation to non-entrained states, and that this comes with breaking the energy function into two having different transformation rules.

The two functions merge in the entrainment ideal and can strongly differ beyond it. As demonstrated, both are important for the energy approach to the long time behavior and stability of systems. Otherwise, huge in-

consistencies arise, as is the case of particle confinement and other systems mentioned in this work.

Behind the energy duality there stands the persistent irreversible drift related to the difference between the two energy functions of system and representing a vortex force field in its phase space. It is essential that the vortex force effect differ radically from that of familiar friction of systems relaxing to entrained states. We see its distinctive features as in the introduced classification of generalized vortex forces and energy flows as in the physics the approach gives to various phenomena.

The principle of energy duality does not rely on quantum mechanics and one cannot but infer from the correspondence principle that a consistent concept of energy quanta is to be either limited by the entrainment ideal or the energy quanta break into two respective sorts beyond the ideal. This disputes common reasonings of non-entrained states in terms of energy quanta.

While the generalized thermodynamic potential theory fits only the entrainment limit, it may look all-sufficient beyond it with fitting via extending the set of variables and parameters. However, the theory then loses its predictive strength and causes misleading associations like the ones revealed in this work. The energy duality is free of these drawbacks and presents a universal energy concept incorporating the vortex physics.

[1] M.S. Green, J. Chem. Phys. **20** (1952) 1281.

[2] E.R. de Groot, P. Mazur, *Non-equilibrium Thermodynamics*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1962.

[3] G R. Graham, H. Haken, Z. Physik **243** (1971) 289; **245** (1971) 141.

[4] H. Risken, *The Fokker-Planck Equation*, Springer, Berlin, 1989.

[5] Herman Feshbach, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **5** (1958) 537.

[6] V.E. Shapiro, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **70** (1976) 1463, English transl. in Sov. Phys. JETP **43** (1976) 763.

[7] V.E. Shapiro, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **89** (1985) 1857, **91** (1986) 1280, English transl. in Sov. Phys. JETP **62** (1985) 1128, **64** (1985) 756.

[8] V.E. Shapiro, Phys. Lett. A **129** (1988) 62.

[9] V.E. Shapiro, J. Mod. Opt. **36** (1989) 151.

[10] V.E. Shapiro, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **23** (1990) 2445.

[11] V.E. Shapiro, Hyperfine Interactions **81** (1993) 223.

[12] V.E. Shapiro, Phys. Lett. A **290** (2001) 288; **295** (2002) 60; **330** (2004) 85.

[13] H.E. Dubin, T.M. O'neil, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71** (1999) 87.